

United States District Court  
Southern District of Texas  
Corpus Christi Division

United States Courts  
Southern District of Texas  
FILED

MAY 05 2021

Nathan Ochser, Clerk of Court

Bobbie Lee Haverkamp  
Plaintiff

vs.

Civil Action 2:17-cv-18

Dr. Owen Murray, Director,  
of UTMBC Correction Manage  
Care Program, et al  
Defendant

Advisory #2

CMHCC Lacks Standing Immunity

Advisory #2  
that CMHCC Lacks Standing  
of Immunity due to Violation  
by Defendants under the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendments

To the Honorable Judge of Said Court,  
Now Comes, Ms Bobbie  
AKA the Plaintiff and presents facts that the  
Defendants they they have standing as a Exception  
to Ex Parte Franks on Immunity is no longer  
they but is Now challenged that the Defendants  
have violate the Plaintiff Equal Protection Rights<sup>①</sup>

① 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment, Equal Protection Clause.

using the theory "they can't be sued or sue"

## Jurisdiction

The Plaintiff comes to the District Court on Advisory #2 that under U.S. Const, Art 3, § 2; 28 U.S.C. § 1331 she may assume this District Court assumes federal question jurisdiction when an action "arises under" the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States.

Advisory #2 is not theory of Immunity but a actual violation Civil Rights Act 42 U.S.C. § 1983

The Plaintiff realizes the Defendants have an appeal on the theory of Immunity based on the government enjoys Immunity

The Plaintiff now challenges any Immunity based (actual violations) of Constitutional Rights by the Defendants.

The District Court has jurisdiction due to a actual violation has occurred and affects the Plaintiff in real time, not Theory.

## Argument

Your Honor, the Plaintiff will keep her legal authorities to a minimum, she will present facts to the District Court, the Court knows the law and can apply it to the Plaintiff's version of facts.

If the Defendants object, the Court can certainly call on the Plaintiff's Attorney's that's defending her in the 5th Circuit on the theory of Immunity against Corbello's theory that her defendants cannot sue or be sued, Your Honor we got real hurt in real time — theory's over with.  
Advisory #2 opens.

In 1945, George Orwell (1903-1950) wrote a Book called "Animal Farm".

The short narrative w the animals on the farm revolted, took over the farm and it was the "Pigs" that took over management of the farm.

As the "Pigs" took over, they mingled with "MEN". One day the farm animals looked in the window and they could not tell the difference between "Pigs and Men".

and the present Civil Action, the Court is real familiar with the past history of Civil Action 2:17-CV-18 so lets skip the history lesson and press on.

This Civil Action is a Amended Complaint formed from D.E. 60 and DE 62 that Mag. Judge B. Jawice Ellington instructed the Plaintiff to file under John/Jane Does due the State had to have time to name the correct Defendants to provide relief.

So the Plaintiff filed the complaint,

John & Jane Does;

- University of Texas Senior Medical Directors
- University of Texas Medical Director of UTMH
- University of Texas Mental Health Service Directors
- University of Texas Medical Branch Directors

Your Honor, the John/Jane Does are taken right out of Director Owen Murray Correctional Managed Health Care Policy<sup>①</sup>, "Treatment of Offenders with Gender Disorders. Effective 5/16/2012

① Case 2:17-cv-18 Document 62-1 Filed TXSD on 10/05/17 p 22 of 23  
IV

The Plaintiff falls dead on this policy, it was diagnosed for Gender Dysphoria by Psychiatrist Dr. Philip Farley June 6, 2013

There are two things that are important in Policy 51.11 dated 5/16/2012:

1) There were University Directors / Mental and Medical that were the approving authorities for treatment plans and hormone therapy related to GID.

2) Policy 51.11 dated 5/16/2012 titled

Treatment of Offenders with Gender Disorders referenced the World Professional Association for Transgender Health as the Standard of Care that the University Directors would use as their Standard of Care and SRS.

Between June 2013 and Jan 2015 all of the above was gatted. The Court asks a fair question, "By whom?!"

The Plaintiff proves in a Prima Facie, when only Dr. Murray the Director of CMHC Policy and the CMHC are allowed to add or delete the

Health Care Policy on the CMHC then the reasonable inferences in absent of a Explanation the CMHC with Dr Murray is responsible for the deletion of adequate medical care that included University Directors, a Standard of Care that included sex-reassignment surgery Hormone therapy with non-invasive treatments that would allow the Plaintiff to live largely as a woman as in Kosilek supra.

#1 There is a direct violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983 based on Deprivation of the 14th Amendment Right to Equal Protection by refusing Access to Medical Care as similarly Situated Cisgender Female Inmates have

Dr. Owens Murray Director of Correctional Manage Health Care and the CMHC have caused Direct Harm using the Theory of Immunity that they cannot be sued or sue yet their policies cause violations of 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and deny Equal Protections to those with Gender Dysphoria.

Your Honor, once harm has been allged then the immunity shield has been pierced ① and those behind the immunity shield are required to come forward, in this case to District Court, to explain their actions.

① Nixon Watergate hearings, "Presidential Immunity" "Executive Privilege."

The defenses is there is direct harm now, whereas before immunity was only theory.

The 5th Circuit has theory of Exception to Ex Parte Franks, and we still have Ex Parte Franks, how to tell them apart.

yet actual harm in the Civil Action has taken place, we are back to "Animal Farm", as the "Pigs" mingled with "Men" no-one can tell them apart.

Your Honor, we are sitting on a Powder Keg for those with Gender Dysphoria.

- Dr. Owen Murray provide no mental health care

- The 5th Circuit allows non-invasive treatments but Dr. Owen Murray won't approve it and his CHCC has written no policies that provide clear direction for those with Gender Dysphoria for the non-invasive treatments much less SRS

- There is no adequate medical care for Gender Dysphoria under any medical guidelines

Your Honor, Dr. Luthicum answer to the Step 2 Grievance voices more than concern, it's a command — Fix the Problem, provide adequate medical care for Gender Dysphoria under G-51.11 w/ Attachments dated 5/16/2012.



Your Honor, the 5th Circuit Approved non-invasive treatments for Gender Dysphoria ruling the non-invasive treatment provided Significant Relief for Gender Dysphoria

Your Honor, Corbello, Dr. Murray, the CCHAC are stalling. While their stalling, people with Gender Dysphoria are being denied any Significant Relief from Gender Dysphoria.

The 5th Circuit ruled in Gibson, supra that non-invasive treatments provided significant relief

The Plaintiff ASK for the 5th Circuit to Significant Relief for her Gender Dysphoria and extend the relief to others in Texas Prisons with Gender Dysphoria.

Your Honor, the Court is well aware of the filed notice that if the Bentressed parties hurt themselves or the Prison making them cut their hair, it was saying under the Jailhouse Lawyers dictates.

A copy of the Advisory was sent to Warden Williams and Sgt Rogers of PRA and Sgt Rogers Supervisory, Selene went to Court and received



verbal reprimand, which the prison saying  
keeps your hair above your shoulders.

Your Honor, Dr. Murray and the CMHCC  
dogged the bullet but that's over with — We  
have harm to transgenders, continues harm that  
requires adequate Medical Care

We need the Significant Relief in the  
form of permanent and temporary. If its  
temporary untill after Corbello, Dr. Murray and  
the CMHCC goes to trial and perhaps to jail

Your Honor, any way, anyone wants to  
cut this, the CMHCC, Dr. Murray, Corbello does  
not have immunity to cause harm to those  
with Gender Dysphoria. ①

So Prays the Plaintiff

Ms Bobbie

4-24-2021

Your Honor the Plaintiff gives notice  
to Dr. Murray, the CMHCC and Corbello the  
Plaintiff intends to call to the witness stand any  
trans-girl that has had physical harm because  
of Dr. Murray and the CMHCC deliberat indifference

① Civil Action 2:17-CV-18 now pivots to confront Dr. Owens  
Murray and company. Your Honor this will be no problem —  
the formation of issues are ready.

Under the Ramos-v-Lamb, the Supreme Court said the Defendants Dr Murray, the CMHCC committee Deliberate Indifference to serious medical need is shown when prison officials have prevented an inmate from receiving recommended treatment. And this case adequate medical care for those with Gender Dysphoria.

The jury will be presented, with Court approval, monetary damages for these trans-girls. The Defendants can open a office on the Stiles Unit for their Mal-practice insurance personal for pay out.

The Plaintiff, Bobbie-Lee Haverkamp declines any monetary Damages.

Your Honor, there's not a jury in the United States will give Dr. Murray and the CMHCC the power to inflicted harm based on any kind of humanity. We are going to have a Jury Trial — Ask them the question!!

If the defendants want to discuss a settlement, have them go to Trans-Pride, Nell Guther and Rights Behind Bars, Samuel Weiss Attorney at Law, then Bleeding Heart Liberals, talk to them.

The Defendants, Dr Murray and the CMHCC have culpability, their going to answer for it.

Your Honor, have the Defendants answer Civil Action 2:17-cv-18, lets go to trial.

So Prays the Plaintiff

Ms. Bobbie

4-24-2021.

### Certification of Service

The Clerk was asks to make a copy and send it to the Texas Attorney General - Ms Corbello and Rights Behind Bars - Samuel Weiss.

So Prays the Plaintiff

Ms Bobbie

Your Honor, the Plaintiff asks the Court to be thinking about a Court Appointed Attorney, were're going to trial, no government official is going to deny culpability. UTMB medical is responsible and their going to provide relief for these young transgender that dont have the sense to come out of the rain - Corbello, Dr. Murray and the CMHCC are responsible, the Plaintiff can prove they dont have insanity, their going to trial.

① The Good, Bad, Ugly.

4-24-2021 ①

The Plaintiff stands by her Civil Suit that's been in the Court 5 years and 245 Court filings Ms Bobbie